

## REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **26 November 2007**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-27. Examiner rejected claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Immonen (US Pub. No. 2003/0120924, hereinafter “PGPub ‘924”), in view of Baker (US Pub. No. 2007/0005962, hereinafter “PGPub ‘962”).

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Examiner rejected claims 1-27 as being unpatentable over PGPub ‘924 (Immonen) in view of PGPub ‘962 (Baker). Applicant agrees with Examiner’s assessment that PGPub ‘924 does not disclose translating the data into a string of words that can be recognized by a human. However, Applicant respectfully disagrees that PGPub ‘962 discloses translating the data into a string of words that can be recognized by a human.

In fact, PGPub ‘962 (Baker) expressly discloses the opposite: using a **one-way key encryption** algorithm to translate a **word or phrase** to produce **data** (see PGPub ‘962, [0060] and FIG. 1). To be more precise, PGPub ‘962 discloses a **one-way encryption** that “translates a **word** or a **phrase** into a form that **cannot** be reversed by any known methods [see PGPub ‘962, [0059]].” For example, a **word** such as “Rosebud” is translated into **data** (code) such as “13n312XN349F349.” PGPub ‘962 discloses that this encryption method is used to encrypt nouns and adjectives in an agreement, but not the conjunctions, verbs, and prepositions, thereby making the nouns and adjectives **unreadable** (see PGPub ‘962, [0018]). The method disclosed by PGPub ‘962 enables two parties to negotiate an agreement without revealing the precise terms of the agreement, but at the same time permitting the parties to understand the basic points of the agreement (see PGPub ‘962, [0020]).

Applicant points out that PGPub ‘962 [0060] mentions that the codebook “translates in both directions,” but this is in reference to *communication* between the sender and the receiver. The PGPub ‘962 uses a **one-way key encryption** algorithm that is well known in the art as being very difficult, if not impossible, to decrypt using available computational resources and techniques (see PGPub ‘962, [0059]). .

In contrast, in embodiments of the present invention, it is the **data** that is translated into a **string of words** (see instant application, [0026] and [0015]). Specifically, embodiments of the present invention translate a 128-bit identifier to a sequence of human-recognizable words using the One-Time Pass (OTP) dictionary (IETF RFC 1938), in which 11-bit numbers are mapped to human-recognizable words (see instant application, [0026] and [0030]-[0031]). The **string of words** is easier for a human to verify than the **data** from which the words are translated. Furthermore, there is no need for a user to manually enter a 128-bit long identifier (see instant application, [0031]).

Nothing within PGPub ‘924 or PGPub ‘962, either separately or in concert, discloses translating the data into a string of words that can be recognized by a human.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 10, and 19, as previously presented, are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-9, which depend upon claim 1, claims 11-18, which depend upon claim 10, and claims 20-27, which depend upon claim 19, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

## CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the application is presently in form for allowance.  
Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Anthony Jones/  
Anthony Jones  
Registration No. 59,521

Date: 26 February 2008

Anthony Jones  
Park, Vaughan & Fleming LLP  
2820 Fifth Street  
Davis, CA 95618-7759  
Tel: (530) 759-1666  
Fax: (530) 759-1665  
Email: tony@parklegal.com